

Holland & Hart LLP  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Patrick J. Reilly, Esq.  
Nevada Bar No. 6103  
Andrea M. Champion, Esq.  
Nevada Bar No. 13461  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134  
Tel: (702) 669-4600  
Fax: (702) 669-4650  
[preilly@hollandhart.com](mailto:preilly@hollandhart.com)  
[amchampion@hollandhart.com](mailto:amchampion@hollandhart.com)

Lee A. Chilcote, Esq.  
Christina C. Tizzano, Esq.  
*Pro hac vice applications pending*  
The Chilcote Law Firm LLP  
The Cedar-Grandview Building  
12434 Cedar Road, Suite Number 3  
Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44106  
Telephone: (216) 795-4117  
Facsimile: (216) 795-4245  
[lee.chilcote@chilcotelaw.com](mailto:lee.chilcote@chilcotelaw.com)  
[christina.tizzano@chilcotelaw.com](mailto:christina.tizzano@chilcotelaw.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant Andrew Sherman*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SONORO INVEST S.A., a Panamanian  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ROBERT MILLER, an individual; ANDREW  
SHERMAN, an individual; COSTAS  
TAKKAS, an individual; and STEPHEN  
GOSS, an individual,

Defendants

and

ABAKAN, INC., a Nevada corporation,

Nominal Defendant.

Case No. : 2:15-cv-02286-JAD-CWH

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
PROTECTIVE ORDER (ECF NO. 85)**

Defendant Andrew Sherman ("Sherman"), by and through his counsel of record, Patrick  
J. Reilly, Esq. and Andrea M. Champion, Esq. of the law firm of Holland & Hart hereby move

for reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's Order Denying the Motion for Protective Order (ECF No. 85) in the above-entitled action. This Motion is based upon the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the papers and pleadings on file in this action, and any oral argument this Court may allow.

DATED this 23rd day of May, 2016.

/s/ Andrea M. Champion  
Patrick J. Reilly, Esq.  
Andrea M. Champion, Esq.  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Lee A. Chilcote, Esq.  
Christina C. Tizzano, Esq.  
*Pro hac vice applications pending*  
The Chilcote Law Firm LLP  
The Cedar-Grandview Building  
12434 Cedar Road, Suite Number 3  
Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44106

*Attorneys for Defendant*  
*Andrew Sherman*

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
OBJECTION TO AND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
OF ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER (ECF NO. 85)**

**I.**

**INTRODUCTION AND RELEVANT BACKGROUND**

On March 30, 2016, Plaintiff served Defendant Andrew Sherman ("Mr. Sherman") with a First Set of Request for Production of Documents (the "RFP"). After reviewing the twenty-five requests in RFP, Mr. Sherman concluded that many of the requests were overly broad and unduly burdensome because they sought matters irrelevant to the claims and defenses in this case and given the broad definitions in the RFPs, could also require Mr. Sherman to produce an exorbitant number of documents.

In an attempt to resolve this discovery dispute, Mr. Sherman's counsel reached out to Plaintiff and the parties met and conferred on two separate occasions. During those conversations, the parties were able to resolve a number of items, including but not limited to

1 agreeing to enter into a stipulated protective order regarding the production of confidential  
2 documents. However, a number of Sherman's objections to the RFP requests could not be  
3 resolved through the meet and confer process.

4 Therefore, on May 16, 2016, Mr. Sherman filed both a Motion for Protective Order (the  
5 "Motion") on the six requests the parties could not agree on (ECF No. 85) and the parties'  
6 Stipulated Protective Order (the "Stipulation") regarding the production of confidential  
7 documents (ECF No. 87).

8 On May 18, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued a minute order, denying Mr. Sherman's  
9 Motion "as moot" "in light of the [parties'] Stipulation (doc. # [87])."<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 90. The Motion  
10 is focused on the six requests Mr. Sherman contends are overly broad and would cause an undue  
11 burden on Mr. Sherman. The Stipulation does not address any particular requests, including the  
12 six in dispute that are the focus of the Motion. Instead, the Stipulation only sets forth how the  
13 parties will handle the production and filing of confidential materials. Therefore, the Magistrate  
14 Judge was mistaken in concluding the Motion and Stipulation covered the same grounds and in  
15 denying the Motion as moot.

## 16 II.

### 17 LEGAL ARGUMENT

18 The Court possesses the inherent procedural power to reconsider, rescind, or modify its  
19 interlocutory orders so long as the Court has jurisdiction. *City of L.A. Harbor Div. v. Santa*  
20 *Monica Baykeeper*, 254 F.3d 882, 885 (9th Cir. 2001). Generally, reconsideration is appropriate  
21 if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error on  
22 the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change or controlling  
23 law. *See Frasure v. United States*, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2003) (internal citations  
24 omitted); *Antonetti v. Skolnik*, No. 3:10-cv-00158-LRH-WGC, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20124,  
25 2013 WL 593407, at \*1 (D. Nev. Feb. 13, 2013) (stating that the Court applies the Rule 59(e)  
26 standards to motion to reconsideration of interlocutory orders).

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> In denying the Motion for Protective Order, the Magistrate Judge also granted the Parties' Stipulation (ECF No. 87).

Here, the Court's decision to deny the Motion is clearly erroneous as the Motion and Stipulation cover different grounds. Mr. Sherman's Motion "focuses on the six requests Plaintiff demands Sherman produce all documents in response, regardless of whether they are related to the allegations made against him or not." ECF No. 85, pg. 2, lns. 23-25. Conversely, the Stipulation sets forth the parties' agreement on how to "adequately protect material entitled to be kept confidential, and [to] ensure that protection is afforded only to material so entitled." ECF No. 87, pg. 2, lns. 22-4. The Stipulation makes no reference to the six requests that are the subject of Mr. Sherman's Motion. See gen. ECF No. 87. Therefore, Mr. Sherman respectfully requests reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's denial of his Motion for Protective Order and asks that the Motion be considered on its merits.

DATED this 23rd day of May, 2016.

/s/ Andrea M. Champion

Patrick J. Reilly, Esq.  
Andrea M. Champion, Esq.  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Lee A. Chilcote, Esq.  
Christina C. Tizzano, Esq.  
*Pro hac vice applications pending*  
The Chilcote Law Firm LLP  
The Cedar-Grandview Building  
12434 Cedar Road, Suite Number 3  
Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44106

*Attorneys for Defendant*  
*Andrew Sherman*

Holland & Hart LLP  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 23rd day of May, 2016, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER (ECF NO. 85)** was served on counsel through the Court's electronic service system as follows:

**Electronic Service:**

Craig Weiner, Esq.  
(*pro hac vice to be submitted*)  
Richard Mescon, Esq.  
(*pro hac vice*)  
Sherli Furst, Esq.  
(*pro hac vice*)  
Michael Kolcun, Esq.  
(*pro hac vice*)  
ROBINS KAPLAN LLP  
601 Lexington Avenue, Suite 3400  
New York, New York 10022-4611  
Tel: (212) 980-7400  
Fax: (212) 980-7499  
Email: [cweiner@robinskaplan.com](mailto:cweiner@robinskaplan.com)  
[rmescon@robinskaplan.com](mailto:rmescon@robinskaplan.com)  
[sfurst@robinskaplan.com](mailto:sfurst@robinskaplan.com)  
[mkolcun@robinskaplan.com](mailto:mkolcun@robinskaplan.com)

James Patrick Shea, Esq.  
Scott D. Fleming, Esq.  
Jamie K. Combs, Esq.  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
3770 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 200  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Tel: (702) 678-5070  
Fax: (702) 878-9995  
Email: [jshea@armstrongteasdale.com](mailto:jshea@armstrongteasdale.com)  
[sfleming@armstrongteasdale.com](mailto:sfleming@armstrongteasdale.com)  
[jcombs@armstrongteasdale.com](mailto:jcombs@armstrongteasdale.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

Maximiliano D. Couvillier III, Esq.  
BLACK & LOBELLO  
10777 West Twain Avenue, Third Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89125  
Tel: (702) 318-5071  
Email: [mcouvillier@blacklobellolaw.com](mailto:mcouvillier@blacklobellolaw.com)

Mark David Hunter, Esq.  
*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
HUNTER TAUBMAN FISCHER LLC  
255 University Drive  
Coral Gables, FL 33134  
Tel: (305) 629-8815  
Email: [mhunter@htflawyers.com](mailto:mhunter@htflawyers.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant*  
*Costas Takkas*

Josephine Binetti McPeak, Esq.  
MCDONALD CARANO WILSON  
2300 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 1200  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102  
Tel: (702) 873-4100  
Fax: (702) 873-9966  
Email: [jmcpeak@mcdonaldcarano.com](mailto:jmcpeak@mcdonaldcarano.com)

Benjamin Calkins, Esq.  
*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
THE CALKINS LAW FIRM, LTD.  
100 North Main Street, Suite 235  
Chagrin Falls, OH 44022  
Tel: (440) 796-4592  
Email: [bencalkins@gmail.com](mailto:bencalkins@gmail.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant*  
*Stephen Goss*

/s/ Yalonda Dekle  
An employee of Holland & Hart LLP

Holland & Hart LLP  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134